

Seattle Monorail Review Panel Meeting Notes for September 15, 2003

<u>Panelists</u>	<u>City Staff</u>	<u>SMP Staff & Consultants</u>	<u>Public</u>
Don Royse, Co-Chair	Newell Aldrich	Bill Bascus	Howard Anderson
Steve Sheehy, Co-Chair	Dawn Bern	Rachel Ben-Shmuel	Geof Logan
Dan Foltz	Dave Boyd	Bob Derry	
Nancy Henderson	Maureen Colaizzi	Jim Gebhart	
Jack Mackie	Layne Cubell	Deb Guenther	
Cary Moon	Marty Curry	Alan Hart	
Vlad Oustimovitch	Kathy A Dockins	Kristina Hill	
Iain M. Robertson	Scott Dvorak	Allen Parker	
Nic Rossouw	David Graves	Suanne Pelley	
Mimi Sheridan	Sandy Howard	Barb Swift	
Paul Tomita	Michael Jenkins	Darby Watson	
Blaine Weber	Martha Lester		
	Michelle Leviant		
	Vince Lyons		
	Ethan Melone		
	Vanessa Murdock		
	John Rahaim		
	Lisa Rutzick		
	Norm Schwab		
	Cheryl Sizov		
	John Taylor		

The meeting began with introductions all around.

Business

Approval of Minutes from August 4, 2003

The minutes from the August 4 meeting were approved with one abstention (Don Royse, who was not present at that meeting).

Staff Update

New Meeting Note Format

Maureen has developed a new format for the meeting notes; does the Panel like the change? The Panel has no complaints.

Design Consultant Selection Process

The Panelists involved in the consultant selection process (Blaine, Vlad, and Nic) all reported that they felt the process was good, and in each case the choice was unanimous. Blaine (Pioneer Square/SODO) was very impressed with the presentations and the tough questions asked, and felt all firms he saw were qualified. Donald King, Miller Hull, and Kathryn Gustafson were selected. Nic (Ballard) thought the questioning was good and that the choice (Don Carlson) was good for Ballard. Vlad (West Seattle) also felt the selection process was good, but was critical of the pre-selection process. He was frustrated that SMP chose to do the short-listing themselves prior to the final selection process, and would have liked a larger pool from which to choose. Mithun was chosen for West Seattle. Maureen added that she attended the public forum and thought it was great.

Important Upcoming Dates

SMP will be presenting the alignment and station locations options in the DEIS to the Design and Planning Commissions at the next MRP meeting on September 22. There will be no new information, but it should generate discussion to help MRP prepare advisory recommendations to Council for their decisions regarding the Transitway agreement.

Panelists are invited to attend City Council's NAC Committee meeting September 23 at 2:00. Steve plans to attend; Don will be out of town. Cary is interested in attending. If anyone else is interested, please let Maureen know.

Panel Member Changes/City Staff Changes

Maureen introduced Design Commissioner Iain M Robertson, who will be replacing Panelist Ralph Cipriani. Dawn Bern, Michael Jenkins, and Alan Miller were all introduced; they are DCLU staff who will all assist in permitting the Monorail. Also, new Council Central staff contact Norm Schwab will replace John Taylor.

SMP Update

The SMP update will be added to the business section of each agenda. Jim Gebhard (Manager of Architecture, Urban Design, & Engineering) and Barbara Swift (Swift & Company) have been added to the team and will be attending future meetings as SMP representatives. Jim gave the following SMP update.

Barbara (with Lee Copeland) will be giving an update on the urban design principles draft and presenting the draft project schedule. She will also be working with Alan Hart doing landscape architecture for the Dravus, Elliott, and Mercer stations. After that, she will work with Via Suzuki to guide the other architects and review their station design work for consistency with the principles. Today, Alan will be presenting sample templates for SMP preliminary and concept-level presentations for Panel review. Rachel will give a briefing on SMP's proposed upcoming review schedule.

Jim was also pleased with the architect selection process. He is glad that all decisions were unanimous, and SMP is currently writing scopes of work and trying to get those architects under contract as soon as possible.

SMP has retained the King County Cultural Development Authority to manage the public art program. SMP has added two artists (Claudia Fitch and Chris Bru) to the guideway design team, and while they came on board late they are now up to speed. There will be an art program update at the October 6 MRP meeting.

City's Design Review and Permitting Process Overview

Ethan Melone, SDoT

Cheryl Sizov, DCLU

This is a continuation of previous discussions about the review process, and the Panel is assured that proposals will always be discussed before the Panel is expected to review design in its final form. Council has adopted the code amendments required for the construction of the Monorail, so there is a measure of certainty about the review process with some details to be filled in.

Using the City Review Process comparison handout (attached) as a guide, Cheryl illustrated how the proposed MRP schedule differs from other City review processes (Seattle Planning Commission, Seattle Design Commission, Design Review Program, and the Light Rail Review Panel). Ethan outlined his document (attached) covering how the City process would differ between review of the stations and of the guideway, with the added differences of design review versus regulation. The primary task of City staff will be to determine in what way(s) the review process needs to be tailored to the Monorail project and the DBOM process. Panel comments are welcome; staff hopes to have a process on which everyone can agree by the September 22 meeting (or October 6 at the latest).

There was some discussion regarding SMP's terminology differing from the City's terminology. An agreement on terminology may be necessary.

Discussion

- I have a question about the direction of the arrows; how does the handoff happen from the architects to SMP to the DBOM contractor?
- I agree. When does SMP responsibility end? This document implies that it ends at 70% design, but now they say 20 to 30%.
- We need consistency in how the project is described; a standard methodology should be followed. Maybe the center column in the handout shifts over to 30%. *This will probably be resolved in the next few meetings after we've been through the DDR discussion. SMP doesn't want to use the traditional terminology, but that's what you're all familiar with.*
- I agree that it's probably closer to 30 or 35%. It's a funny hybrid. *Again, this will probably be resolved after we have a better sense of when things will happen.*
- What's in the DDRs is what's going to matter. *Maybe we should establish a glossary if standard terms are not used.*
- I recommend that staff go to Council Central Staff and find out when information is needed from the Panel for Council decisions.

MRP Review Schedule and SMP Project Schedule

Rachel Ben-Shmuel and Jim Gebhard, SMP

SMP found the August 4 comments from the MRP extremely useful for revision of the schedule. While this version includes MRP revisions, it should not be considered the final version, as SMP would like one more round of comments from the Panel. SMP understands that the Panel wants both the big picture as well as hierarchical flow, and wants to see the impact of each segment,

not just the stations within. This schedule is an introduction to the next agenda item (Corridor-wide UD Goals and Principles).

Rachel distributed the next draft of the schedule. The squares and octagons indicate MRP review. The square is the first review; the octagon is after MUP submittal and DCLU corrections. This draft of schedule has more detail than the original draft. The next iteration will be broken down even more, with a more accurate representation of the number of stations reviewed at each meeting.

Maureen pointed out that City staff has worked with SMP to integrate SMP's schedule with MRP review. With approximately 45 minutes to one hour per review, the Panel could review three stations per meeting. That's not final, but a good indicator of what the Panel could digest. The next schedule should reflect that. This extends SMP's schedule a bit, but they are definitely trying to work with the Panel on this.

Discussion

- I appreciate SMP's accommodation but wonders how much the schedule can stretch and if there will be problems? *We are finding ways to "smooth things out" and we can make it work, possibly by having more meetings. This handout is based on the current meeting schedule, but the Panel will have to decide if you want to meet more frequently and let City staff know. The MRP schedule is about 1 ½ months longer than the SMP schedule, which constitutes about four additional meetings. Another option is a one-day or half-day retreat.*
- I'm concerned there may be review needed before the close of the DEIS comment period. Will the 9/22 and 10/6 meetings generate enough discussion and review to give a credible response to City Council? *The EIS is primarily for impacts and mitigation, not design. It can be done before an alignment is selected. Also the Planning Commission is reviewing the DEIS separately, and their work will inform the MRP. Staff is maintaining communication with Council so the MRP will be well-positioned to give input when it is requested. Currently, Council's schedule is unknown, as is when they intend to announce an alignment preference. The alignment decision is part of the Transitway agreement, but there may be prior resolution. It's been discussed, but not determined. We have no dates, but we do have the sequence. Everything will "dovetail."*
- Maybe the review of the alignment (not the stations) should be done in big "chunks" instead of spread out. Perhaps that's what a few partial-day sessions or longer meetings could be used for.
- I'm concerned about defining criteria for the DDRs; there seems to be a gap in the process. With the Design Review Program, the proponent first shows an understanding of the site and its requirements/context. The DDR criteria need to be defined, and that needs to go to the designers as soon as possible. We need to see what's important in a design sense, not a construction sense. *That will be covered in agenda item #4 (Alan's presentation on the DDR Template).*

Corridor-wide Urban Design Goals and Principles

Barbara Swift, Swift & Company

Because the City has a history of successful review of complex projects through the Design Commission, the SDC Handbook was used as a reference in the creation of these Goals and Principles. Also, because the City values content, this is a contextually responsive process. SMP and MRP will be able to use this as a tool for review of the project. Once it has been finalized, a smaller, portable version of the goals and principles will be created so Panel members and staff can use them for easy reference.

SMP has been charged with creating a prominent piece of civic architecture. Swift & Company is charged with giving guidance and assistance to SMP to help them realize the design potential of the monorail. They will also give guidance to the civil design team, using the goals and principles as part of the coordination process. This is a complex project in a finely-grained and diverse community, so they want to make sure it's done right.

For guidance, they've looked at the City structure to see what provides both continuity and distinction in the City. Looking at the dynamic scale (corridor to station to street level), they ran through four questions for each: aesthetics, place-making, function, and environment (as shown in the handout). Within the Monorail's envelope, changes depend upon circumstance and context. Integrating the Monorail into the fabric of the city is also dependent upon the coordination of many partners.

Goals are defined broadly. Principles are the actions from which the goals are. The criteria are the specific actions which satisfy the goal. Swift & Company chose to look at other systems for patterns and opportunities to attain the Monorail's goals.

The current document includes goals and principles only; consultants are still working on the criteria. Using the Monorail project to illustrate the definitions above, the goal would be the system; the principles would reinforce what is in the neighborhood plans; the criteria would be much more specific (e.g. pertaining to Market/15th in Ballard).

Integration of landscaping into the Monorail corridor will contribute to several overarching goals: integration of the landscape is the general principle; specifying connections to existing natural resources would be the specific principle; and the criterion would be identifying ecosystems.

The document also shows the identification of typologies. Swift & Company is looking at the characteristics of the corridor, particularly Delridge, Interbay, and Harrison. Couple that with the street environment itself, and you get eight or nine typologies out of it.

Discussion

- Thanks for this; it is a huge leap forward. It's consistent and comprehensive. I suggest the goals be more assertive and bold, not apologetic. I'm concerned about criteria definition, that it will be too "motherhood and apple pie" and I don't want to lose the only chance to define a great system. What do you want the design to say about technology, transportation, bikes, etc? Be more specific about SMP's design ideas and approach. Use the goals to be broad and creative initially; the criteria will rein in some of that.
- I also thank you! I haven't absorbed this fully yet, but I have read it. The next time it's printed, I suggest every "should" be replaced with "will" or "must." This is far too passive to be given to a DBOM contractor. Take a stand now. I'm also concerned about landscape text ("now" vs. "future"): will this leave an opening? *That could just mean SMP provides a dirt plot which a later developer would then landscape.*
- I'm concerned that current drawings don't show those gaps, and that Panel needs to see where they are. Panel needs to see what will actually be done by SMP, not what might happen later. *The goal is to look broadly at how the Monorail can be integrated into the landscape and not constrain ourselves. We'll be sure to show specifically what we are going to do.*
- I'm glad consultants are looking at different parts along the corridor. In some places there will be more opportunities for assertive, bold goals. The entire thing doesn't have to be the same. There are differences throughout, including the different character of

- neighborhoods. *The development of strategies will be shown in the document.*
- This is a great framework. Will other urban design segments be integrated into it? *Other presentations have not looked at segments from a global context. We are meeting with all consultants to look at each's site-specific criteria, and the best way to present the documents. This may be a chapter toward the beginning. This is a living document, and its basis of evaluation will bring the others back to it. They'll become notebooks to evaluate how a station is doing.*
 - Is the intent to have MRP adopt this document? If so, how, since it's a "living" document? If it's NOT to be adopted, how will it be used and what is its holding authority? *The SMP board will adopt the guidelines, but as yet no decision has been made as to whether anything more is to be adopted. The templates (in the next presentation) will be the method of guideline application to see if design adheres to the guidelines.*
 - Has the document been given to each of the separate teams? *The teams will receive it this week, there will be weekly meetings, and the teams are contracted to the substance of the document. They have a number of directive documents: a workbook, a kick-off functional plan, stakeholder & public outreach documents, and a guideway workbook.*
 - This is an elegant framework to work through issues, but eventually the process must get to the product. As the blank sections get filled in, they'll inform the product.
 - Why isn't Seattle Center shown as open space? *It was intended to be.*
 - Can SMP show what will be adopted and what is guidance (difference between "should" and "must/will")? We'd like differentiation.
 - Yes, an iterative process is better; a conveyor-belt approach could be disastrous. *It may just be a matter of appropriate word choice. The book isn't a cheat sheet or quick tool; it will develop into something that has goals and guidelines on a small, easily-referenced (4-page) document.*
 - I appreciate the substantive comments here, but I find this document hard to navigate. Page numbers, date of issue, tabs – all these would be useful. *We have discussed having an appendix. We'll still have fold-out graphics.*
 - As long as there are tabs, that's okay!
 - I'm concerned about lack of connection with bike representatives. *We have connected with them, but that's not indicated here.*
 - How will the typologies be used? Are they about finding consistency within a neighborhood or is it more of an "if/then" process? *Each topic will answer an "either/or" question ("is this in the vicinity of an urban center or not?" "Is it in a residential area or is it not?"), which will allow SMP to say, "For typology #X, these are the basic needs and this is what's recommended. In addition, this is what we'd like to occur." There will be patterns of similarity and patterns of differences.*
 - So far I like what I hear about the corridor-wide requirements. How will you ensure the translation as the document becomes more specific, e.g. elegant expression of the structure and honesty of materials (expressing them, not hiding them)? The possibilities for place-making are exciting. The criteria should encourage the designers to improve the public realm, not apply just to the stations.
 - When will the final draft of this document be ready and will it come before the Panel again? Does SMP need the Panel's feedback in the form of supporting how SMP is to use the document? There is a lot of good work here; maybe it could be shared collaboratively.
 - I don't think adoption is required; these are pretty uncontroversial and a living document may be best in case site conditions, etc need to be re-evaluated in the future. Adopting now seems premature; this has more value as a working document.
 - Council will adopt design guidelines at some point. After more review we may want to

return to Cheryl's question so we can better inform Council. *We may come back with design guidelines before we come back with a second draft of this document.*

- I feel it is not the Panel's job to design this project, so it is not its job to draft SMP's design guidelines. The Panel needs to adopt its own to present to Council, and NOT a working document.
- I'm confused about what Council is considering for adoption. *SMP is drafting a document for the consultants; the City is drafting a document for those doing the permitting; and Council will be adopting a document. My question is will any of these be suitable for both? The logical thing, given SMP's effort, would be to review it and make revisions based on community input, then endorse and send it to Council.*
- I want to be sure clarity is imparted to the design team so the presentations to MRP are consistent and clear. I feel the guidelines should be finished in time to be meaningful by the October 6 meeting. *We think the best plan is to release it so discrepancies can be identified. The final draft will be ready by the end of this month. We are trying to actuate a standard and want more consistency in the approach to station design.*
- I have a problem with an image of trees near the end of the document. There are trees shown in the shadow of the structure but pictured like trees growing in open space. That's inaccurate; those trees won't look like that if they're in the shade; they won't grow there. Please present more accurate images in future presentations.
- I just want to add that the guidelines are important, but in terms of ensuring the quality of the final product, what's more important is talented designers and the review process being done by this Panel.

Action

The Panel thanks Barbara Swift for coming and for preparing the document. It is comprehensive, consistent, thoughtful, and very useful in our review process. We appreciate the idea that this is a "living" document, look forward to seeing the final draft and using it as a basis for the City's design guidelines, and would like to make the following recommendations:

- We encourage you to make some of the goals more confident and celebratory of the potential of the Monorail;
- We recommend the language be more specific about what SMP will do in the context of what you hope others (developers) might do in the future (use "must" and "will" in the elements you require and "should" in the elements you recommend);
- We request that the document be more organized and easily navigable in general;
- We recommend the criteria be strong and specific, but that SMP not be afraid to let them change over time;
- We encourage you to inspire the design teams' creativity by asking them evocative questions about what they will express through their design, with regard to (e.g.) technology, public transit, bikes, sustainability, neighborhood context, etc.
- We encourage you to keep some of the criteria focused not only on the stations and guideway, but the public realm created by the stations and guideway (i.e. around and below them/it);
- We caution SMP on its unrealistic depiction of trees growing near the guideway, and request a more accurate image.

The action was passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Geof Logan gave the following public comment after the action, as it was not directly related to the agenda item under discussion.

- The Code revisions were approved by Council today. I'd like to thank the Panel for pressing Council to give more time for public comment. It allowed more input and there were some amendments because of that. One amendment related to the financial

viability of the project. Unfortunately, the project is in financial trouble due to City budget cuts and potential budget cuts, and may not be able to follow through on some of its promises. I ask that the Panel view its work through the prism of the project's financial problems.

Detailed Design Requirement Template Discussion

Jim Gebhart, SMP

Alan Hart, Via Suzuki

These templates will allow the application of many of the goals and principles in the document you just saw. We've also incorporated comments from public outreach and technical information. The two templates shown were for Initial Submission (Schematic Design), with site/context analysis and Response (Concept Design), with the design response to the Panel's initial review. It will create dialogue as how this is applied to the DBOM process. A framework is needed of what's important in the design: form may be critical for one (station) while material may be more important for another.

SMP feels it's important to bring MRP in early so the Panel can provide guidance, both on the design analysis and the templates themselves. Documents previously shown to the Design Commission are the basis for these templates, which will be tied back to specific guidelines. They will be applied to the "model" stations: Mercer and Dravus. For continuity, Barbara Swift will be the landscape architect.

The Vancouver system was used to give these templates some context (we didn't want to be presumptuous and use an actual Seattle station). The way the stations are linked with each other and the buildings, having dialogue with each other, is hard to capture in a stand-alone template.

Each presentation will use the following templates:

Preliminary Concept

Process Description – map of "how-to" at this point

Program & Scope of Work – items driving design for specific locations, elements of continuity, moving people through, and other issues (if we've forgotten any, we'd like the Panel's input)

Context: Site – the "nitty gritty" opportunities and constraints of the particular site

Context: Aerial – aerial photos, as each station can be experienced from several different viewpoints

Context: Aerial Perspective – landscape opportunities/eco-tones (transitions from one ecosystem to another)

Context: Site Photographs – 360-degree informational context

Urban Design Analysis – drawings by urban designers; working to standardize; in perspective

Site Concept Plan – specific, diagrammed site analysis

Station Sections – relationship to other buildings, movement, opportunities

Landscape & Lighting Concept – ecotones, broad issues (currently blank)

Mobility Integration Concept – ensuring signals are pedestrian-friendly; addressing kiss 'n' ride, intermodal

Sustainable Practices Concept – opportunities for particular sites; dealt with on a station-by-station basis; this will evolve a lot more

Entry Concept – important to understand working with the ground plane

Phasing Concept – relationship to existing urban fabric (whether SMP or other development)

CPTED Concept – potential crime or "dark" areas; what potential measures we may need to

take

Concept Sketches – dealing with geometrics of the site (currently blank)

Design Development

Table of Contents – intent of document; also nature of form (materials), function

Design Rationale/Urban Design Issues – ties back to first document

CPTED Principles/Sustainability Principles – responses to sustainability principles

Site Plan – this and the others below (flipped through several pages) are in response to the first document and will have a lot more graphic information representing the process used to get from the first presentation to the second.

Ground Floor Plan

Platform Plan

Roof Plan

Landscape Plan

Elevation

Retail Infill Concept

Station Rendering

Platform Study Diagrams – weather and relation to passenger comfort

Platform Canopy Concept – explains materials; some of these sections will probably be four or five pages because of complexity

Platform Section – relationship between guideway structure, the platform, the beam, etc

Building Cross Sections

Roof/Elevator Relationship Study – dealing with architectural problems related to code, raising the roof, etc.

Model Photographs – study and presentation models to identify important elements

Materials Study

Outline Specifications

SMP would like comments on how to improve this template; feel free to mark up the document. Certain items on which they're focusing are the fact that Monorail is shaping the City as it's reacting to the City, and design needs to reflect that. Also, weather will play a key role in passenger comfort. The study models will help identify important elements. The outline specification will highlight anticipated materials to describe the net design effect the Panel wants. We're looking for MRP input so we can apply the templates to Mercer, Dravus, and the Interbay Corridor.

Discussion

- This is really good, though hard to absorb. How are the design ideals developed for each station? *There are different site opportunities for Dravus and Queen Anne, and we are responding to different levels at each site so we can quickly take what is the high-level priority.*
- Who will review the construction documents from the DBOM contractor to ensure compliance with the guidelines? *It's not finalized, but they will talk to the design consultants in order to work toward the best solution.*
- I'm still not satisfied with the response regarding the gap between the architect/designer and the DBOM contractor. This is a very complete document, but the importance of pre-design analysis in addition to review of schematic design cannot be overestimated. Also, there is nothing here regarding public input. Aside from the overview, the site plans need more context. I want to see the buildings behind the guideway/station. Study models are also useful, and page numbers. *We have information about public input/community involvement which will be covered next week. The Mercer/Dravus/Interbay representative will be here as well.*

- If the example used (Vancouver system) was DBOM and guideway was DB, and if the Monorail was originally supposed to be DB, why is it now DBOM? *That decision was before the public vote and before SMP or MRP were established. After the vote and some consideration, this was determined to be the best option. We believe the model is workable.*
- I'm concerned that SMP not make the same mistakes as other proponents have to the Design Commission. The Panel needs a larger view of the context: permanent and experiential impacts; current and future uses; official and "counter-culture" uses. More context is needed everywhere.
- I urge SMP to follow the DC's "nine-block rule" with street vacations: look away from the station. That will help.
- Also, look at presentations not from the standpoint of a building, where the structure itself is the focus, but at what it will be like from the ground level, underneath the guideway. We need to see a close-up experience from underneath. *I agree that the relation to the street is important, but there are also opportunities to look down in a way that's different from buildings.*
- I need clarity regarding what will be in MRP's second review and when (in the process) that will take place.
- I feel progress has been made, but I wonder about the guideway outside of the stations: is that prescribed (the 120' column distance already seen by the Panel)? That will impact station design, so must it be that consistent and when will it be integrated into this discussion? The influence on the pedestrian realm will be huge. *There are many elements to that discussion; it's difficult because of the number of driveways and utilities (above and underground), but we are not set on that. We'll use the typologies to take the same approach with the guideway. They won't be general solutions, but specific to individual conditions.*
- Please consider that this is more about the corridor as a whole. The stations make up very little of it. Corridor decisions need to be made from that point of understanding. It's a missing piece. *Yes, but if the stations aren't dealt with early, engineering can take over. They (guideway and stations) should be looked at simultaneously.*
- How will public art be handled? Does that go to the DBOM contractor as well? *We're in the process of formulating a strategy now; we're aiming for an answer by the October 6 meeting. It is a budget issue. Funding will have to be allocated by some means; it should be separately administered.*
- The mobility study needs to be enhanced. Changes and mitigations to the existing right-of-way need to be shown; also the relation to Metro or other systems (connections, relocations), crosswalks, bikes, kiss 'n' ride, etc. *We hope to bring that next time, but with the 20+ other things we'd like to embellish that may not be possible by Monday (the 22nd).*

Action

The Panel thanks Alan and Jim for coming and for responding to the Panel's request for clarity and consistency. This will aid the design teams so their time is spent on good design and not how to do the presentation; reliance on the DDRs and a level of specificity will be important. The Panel has the following concerns:

- there seems to be a gap between the handoff from the design team to the DBOM contractor: who will control value engineering and the translation of early design to final production;
- we encourage you to explore how public input will be integrated into the process and look forward to further discussion of site plans and elevations;
- we would like SMP to ensure that design contracts require physical models presented when appropriate;

- we recommend a larger context view, to include the public realm: not only permanent elements of a site but also experiential, not only current conditions but also future, not only official uses but also counter-culture uses, etc;
- we urge SMP to follow the "nine-block rule" applicable to alley vacations: look at the larger urban fabric and not just the immediate context of a given station or the guideway. Evaluate the stations as well as the space underneath;
- we request clarity regarding final deliverables and the Panel's final review stage (i.e. "what is 35%?"), as well as when infrastructure issues will be incorporated into design;
- we look forward to the development of public art strategies;
- we request additional details regarding right-of-way mitigation and the acknowledgement that the pedestrian experience is paramount;
- we urge you to integrate the guideway package into the review process.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.